

MICHAEL SHIPPEY, PH.D.

September 29, 2004
Page 4 of 9 Page(s)

- 19. {Original} The book of Claim 16, further including means for rendering said book buoyant in water.
- 20. {Currently Amended} The book of Claim 16, further including an additional portion of flexible, waterproof, tear-resistant material that extends from said folded sheet one of said stiffening means, said additional portion is attached to the rest of said sheet by a multiplicity of perforations, so that it can be removed.

10

5

In the specification:

At page 7, second paragraph:

Fig 2 shows the book in an open position. In this view the opposing sides 24 and 26 can be clearly seen. The respective ends of sheet 22 are adhered to the insides of covers 12 and 14 by adhesive <u>17</u>. This format of book construction allows the user to view the entire contents of either side of sheet 22 at one time.

20



MICHAEL SHIPPEY, PH.D.

September 29, 2004
Page 6 of 9 Page(s)

Section 3. Reply to the Office re §112 objections

Applicant has amended claims 12 and 20 to fall in accord with Figure 4, in accordance with Examiner's observation.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §112 objections raised in the Office Action to the current invention be canceled in light of the claims amendments above.



5

15

20

25

MICHAEL SHIPPEY, Ph.D. September 29, 2004

Page 7 of 9 Page(s)

Section 4. Reply to the Office re §103 objections

Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of §103 objections raised in the Office Action, based on the following considerations. Examiner suggests that claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 11, and 16-19 in the instant application are rendered obvious by US patent no. 4,586,729 granted to inventors Beylerian et al (hereafter Beylerian '729), in light of US patent no. 6,702,331, granted to inventors Derraugh et al (hereafter Derraugh '331).

Applicant respectfully suggests that nothing in either Beylerian '729 or Derraugh '331 discloses the use of tear-resistant sheeting in the inventions disclosed therein. Both patents are silent as to the notion of tearing and resistance thereto. Indeed, the Beylerian '729 patent teaches <u>away</u> from tear-resistance. The following quote is taken from Beylerian '729 at column 3, paragraph 5:

" The folio sheets may be made of any of a variety of conventional sheet materials, such as paper or sheet plastic."

And further in the same patent, at column 4, paragraph 5:

"Thus, where it is desired to employ the folio case for memorandum or diary entry purposes, the requisite number of sheets are provided formed of sheet material such as paper, on which written entries may readily be inscribed."

Since paper is well-known in the art to tear easily, it must be noted that the Beylerian '729 patent teaches away from tear-resistance.

The Derraugh '331 patent is devoted to children's foam books, which is not really in the scope of the current invention. Perhaps surprisingly, the Derraugh '331 patent is silent as to the need for tear-resistance in children's books. Instead, this patent speaks to water-resistance and the absence of hard edges and corners that might injure young children.



MICHAEL SHIPPEY, PH.D.

September 29, 2004
Page 8 of 9 Page(s)

Claims 5 and 9 in the instant application were also rendered obvious, in the Examiner's eyes, by the above Beylerian '729 patent in light of US published patent application no. 2002/0167159, inventor Legrand, published on Nov. 14, 2002.

Applicant respectfully suggests that the Legrand application does not teach the use of waterproof adhesive as a book binding agent in the manner of the current invention. Indeed, Legrand is far from this concept. In Legrand, the binding is achieved via a binding cord. In fact, the Legrand teaches away from using ANY adhesive as a book binding agent. In the following excerpt from paragraph 12 of the Legrand application:

"The improvements of the present invention over the prior art are easily seen and include the fact that the use of a binding cord to secure the pages to one another eliminates the possibility of toxic glue substances being used to bind the pages which could be accidentally ingested by a young individual using the book."

Given all these differences, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the §103 anticipation objections raised in the Office Action to the current invention.

20

5

10

15